

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

Overall Rating

4

### Ratings Summary

<i><b>BOND ACT CRITERIA</b></i>	<i><b>RATING</b></i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		273%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

### Non-Evaluative Comments

Library services are currently provided from a 1,200 square foot leased facility. According to the Bond Act Regulations (Title 5, Division 2, Chapter 3, Article 1), a leased facility is considered to be an existing library if the lease has a total duration of not less than 20 years.

### Project Summary

<i><b>Applicant:</b></i>	<b>Kern, County of</b>
<i><b>Library Jurisdiction:</b></i>	<b>Kern County Library</b>
<i><b>Project Type/Priority:</b></i>	<b>New Library/1</b>
<i><b>Project Square Footage:</b></i>	<b>9,972</b>
<i><b>State Grant Request:</b></i>	<b>\$3,382,960</b>

# EVALUATION FORM

## Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

### Age and Condition of Existing Library

**RATING**

**4**

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

#### Age Rating

4 = No Existing Facility

4 = 1949 or older

3 = 1950-1959

2 = 1960-1964

1 = 1965-1974

0 = 1975-2003

**4**

**N/A**

#### Structural Renovation Rating

4 = No Renovation

4 = 1954 & earlier

3 = 1955-1962

2 = 1963-1972

1 = 1973-1978

0 = 1979-2003

4 = Extremely Poor Condition

3 = Poor condition

2 = Acceptable condition

1 = Good condition

0 = Very good condition

#### Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural

2. Lighting

3. Energy

4. Health & Safety

5. ADA

6. Acoustical

7. Flexibility

8. Spatial Relationships

9. Site Considerations

**N/A**

**N/A**

**N/A**

**N/A**

**N/A**

**N/A**

**N/A**

**N/A**

**N/A**

R1	R2	R3

### Rating panel comments

**Library construction date:** No existing Library

**Library renovation date:**

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

### Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

**RATING**

**3**

#### Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

**N/A**

R1	R2	R3
4	4	3
3	4	4
3	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3

#### Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
2	2	2
2	1	2
2	1	2
3	2	2

#### Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	3
4	4	4

#### Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3

#### Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
2	2	2
3	3	3
3	3	3
2	1	2
2	2	2
2	1	2
3	2	2
2	2	2

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

#### Rating Panel Comments

R1:

**Needs Assessment:**

The needs assessment process include 19 focus groups and 22 interviews, resulting in 9% of the residents being involved in providing input. The process was an open-ended one -- that is, responses were not limited to evaluation of existing services, but current services were considered along with "visioning," which should result in library services more responsive to the needs of the community. An excellent space needs assessment analysis with good use of needs assessment / demographic factors during the allocation of collections. A comprehensive breakdown of collections and shelving requirements as well.

**Plan of Service:**

The plan of service responds to the findings of the needs assessment, including those of K-12 students. The goals and objectives adequate, but the planning process appears to launch directly from goals to a list of activities, rather than defining the objectives. The objectives would benefit from fine-tuning to ensure that staff is able to implement the services as intended.

**Joint Use Agreement:**

While the school district appears to be receiving more benefit from the agreement than does the library, the district is providing funding for homework assistance, and students will receive community service credits for volunteering. The intent for frequent review and modification of services (quarterly).

**Building Program:**

The general requirements appear to be exceptionally well done and comprehensive. Exceptional description of the spatial relationships in narrative form. The use of a spatial diagram would have been helpful. Very comprehensive and excellent job of detailing each space description.

**Conceptual Plans:**

Optimal matching of net and non-assignable square footage (both at 25%) on the plan with the building program. The conceptual plans appear to meet most all of the critical spatial relationships called for in the building program. In some cases, there is no way to tell if the conceptual plans meet the spatial relationships for some of the spaces since the conceptual plans do not break out all of the spaces called for in the building program (see the spaces in the Children's Area as an example). However, given that this is such a small library and it appears the spatial relationships have been met on a more global (division) level, this is not a significant problem for this project. The proximity of the children's area to the reference area is questionable.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

R2:

#### **Needs Assessment:**

An excellent example of a needs assessment and its documentation. Methodology is varied and obtains information from a broad audience. Also provides an excellent presentation of the results of the various assessment tools -- detailed and clear as well as appropriate summaries of the data. Community analysis is excellent and sufficiently in-depth -- and they drew conclusions re service issues based on the various community factors described. Extremely clear presentation. Provided an excellent statement of service needs without moving on to detailing responses to those needs in most cases -- left that to the Plan of Service, as is appropriate. In addition the service needs cited are clearly responsive to the needs assessment results.

#### **Plan of Service:**

The stated goals effectively encompass the needs defined. The objectives, however, are not user-oriented and really reflect activities that need to be accomplished to fulfill unstated objectives for their various user groups. There is way too much detail in the types of services description, so much so that the actual descriptions of the types of services get lost in the 45 pages of text describing users, community, needs, current performances as well as the services proposed. The fit with the jurisdiction-wide plan is more a description of what the branch obtains for administration and listing of branch services than how the project itself supports the systemwide plan.

#### **Joint Use Agreement:**

The agreement is not mutually-beneficial. However, the district does contribute \$10,000 annually for homework help expenses; provides programs; 2 copies of core curriculum as well as online access to the district's catalog and resources materials, and community service credits for volunteering for specific functions in the library. District does not commit to any specific staffing levels. Library contributes significantly more, but the district is contributing. Agreement does not state any timeframe for review and modification, but the "collaborative projects" addendum speaks to quarterly meetings to assess and consider joint activities. Would be good if this had been formally agreed to in the agreement itself.

#### **Building Program:**

The General Requirements section for the library building is superior in its thorough description of the different project aspects that the architect will need to know. The spatial relationships are described exceptionally well. A bubble diagram is not provided. It would have enhanced the text description as a communication tool with the architect. The sizing and descriptions of the individual spaces are extremely well done.

#### **Conceptual Plans:**

The net and non-assignable SF matched the Building Program extremely effectively. The spatial relationships are well done in matching the Building Program requirements for the larger division areas. However, the larger areas are not divided into their respective smaller divisions, such as, the Children's Library has a Children's Collection and Seating and a Juvenile Collection and Seating. These are not shown on the plan. The fact that this proposed library is less than 10,000 sq. ft. does not make this a critical issue.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

R3:

#### **Needs Assessment:**

Have done a very good job with the needs assessment. Multi-faceted approach that included focus groups, interviews, and input from teachers and students. Survey was available in Spanish. Have done an excellent job at displaying responses from different schools in the area and have included an excellent cross section of community organizations and service needs.

#### **Plan of Service:**

Proposed goals relate to needs assessment findings. Objectives are really activities that list duties that the staff will do. Jurisdiction services are listed with little analysis as to how the proposed project fits into the bigger picture.

#### **Joint Use Agreement:**

This agreement is not a sincere partnering effort--the library seems to be more of a benefactor. The school district is committed to providing an annual allocation of \$10,000 in operational expenses that is to be used for homework assistance.

#### **Building Program:**

General requirements are exceptionally broad and detailed in scope (e.g., nature of local water supply and how design should compensate).

Space relationships appropriate, with some exceptions:

No supervision of children's restrooms is specified (although the Children's area in general is to be supervised, Although relationships among major divisions are stated, rationale for detail within those spaces is omitted

Individual spaces are well described and sized. Detail is extensive

#### **Conceptual plans:**

Both assignable sq. ft. and gross sq. ft. conform very well to the Building Program requirements.

Study Rooms are not in sight of Circ. desk, contra to the Building Program.

Although consistent with Program (the problem has been noted under Building Program above), having Periodicals between Reference and Non-fiction collections is very strange.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

#### ***Integration of Electronic Technologies***

**RATING**

**4**

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

#### **Integration of Electronic Technologies**

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

#### **Rating Panel Comments**

R1:

The general requirements section of the building program provides a description of the importance of technology to libraries and stresses the need for flexibility for future technologies. Wiring for technology is provided throughout the building, allowing for the needed flexibility. Distance learning capacity is provided in the study/tutor rooms, and the meeting room will provide excellent connectivity for a variety of needs.

R2:

This plan provided a very clear narrative of the current and future planning regarding technological support. It also provided technical detail which will make it a useful document to those who are trying to implement the plan at the library as well as the headquarters. The section regarding the ongoing technical support that will be provided by Kern County headquarters and by SJVLS is an extremely useful addition for the reviewer or the community member who is interested in how all the pieces will be supported.

R3:

Have done an excellent job at responding to identified community needs and in planning for future needs.

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

### Site

**RATING**

**4**

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

#### Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

**N/A**

4	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

#### Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
2	2	2
3	2	3
3	3	3
3	2	3



4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

#### Rating Panel Comments

**Drainage issues:** There are watercourses that must be controlled with a catch basin an piped from the site, but this should not be a major problem.

**Geotechnical issues:** The site is located in an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone and is 450 feet from the San Andreas Fault. A 50 foot wide tear fault zone cuts across the eastern portion of the site in the vicinity of the proposed parking lot. After an excavation of 210 feet of trench testing 9-15 deep, they did not find any features which would preclude the development of the proposed project. The site does have the potential for strong ground shaking.

R1:

The proposed library site is in the southeast corner of the library service area. However, it is centrally located in terms of where the people in the service area reside and travel since much of the service area is national forest.

The site is one block from Frazier Mtn Park Road (4 to 5,000 vehicles / day) the major east/west transportation corridor in the area and one block from Monterey Trail (4 to 4,500 vehicles / day) a major north/south corridor.

The library is located on the southern edge of the main commercial area, but near a community hall, senior center, post office, and retail businesses. The site is adjacent to the county park.

There are 3 stops for the Kern County Regional Transit within 1/4 mile of the site with the main transit stop being a tenth of a mile from the site. School busses also stop across from the library site. There is also a dial-a-ride service with door-to-door service and reduced fares for seniors, disabled and youth.

The site appears to be very accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists. There are bicycle paths throughout the community and there will be 20 bicycle parking spaces located near the front entrance to the library, however, they do not appear to be sheltered.

There are 39 on-site parking spaces and 105 off-street parking spaces within 500' of the front door and another 98 on street spaces within 500' of the front door.

While not on the major thoroughfare or in the most commercialized area of the community, the site will be quite visible in this small rural mountain community.

The site selection process included staff researching site selection criteria, use of a consultant, 3 focus groups county supervisors approval and wholehearted support of the community as the "best site."

The conceptual plans do not show plans for future expansion of the building or parking on the site.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

R2:

The drawings do not include an area plan showing major roads mentioned in the Application. (E.g., can't tell where Frazier Park Road is, from the submitted sheets). Be that as it may, the site is in the center of the population area - an area which is attenuated along the major road.

The site is long couple of blocks from Frazier Mtn. Park Rd. and stores, but is close to the local County buildings. Convenient bus stops mentioned in Application not shown on drawings. Paratransit seems very convenient throughout daytime hours.

Extensive and eclectic non-vehicle transportation is provided for: street bicycle paths, mountain bikes, skateboards, etc. - and parking and storage therefore.

Autos should have no difficulty in getting to the Library: Park Drive itself is an arterial, and Frazier Mountain Park Rd. is a (long) block away. Appropriate on-site parking is provided, and there is extensive street parking adjacent.

Bicycle parking is generous, but not sheltered, and not visible from the Circ. Desk. Adding storage for skateboards, etc. is unusual and appropriate.

App. p. 13 states that the building will be prominently visible from Frazier Mtn. Park Rd., but without an area map that includes that, and a topo section to present the line of sight to the building, this reviewer is unable to validate the statement. However, no question that it will be visible from Park Drive, and that if the intended directional signs (CalTrans etc. permitting) are installed, people will find the Library.

Having the Library in the core of the "downtown" area is appropriate and desirable.

The site selection process was extensive. Participation in validating the site involved 9% of the community, an impressive proportion.

The site barely accommodates the building footprint and onsite parking. Only the most minimal of landscaping is provided (but this is a well-forested area).

The elongated building makes for less-than-desirable relationships among interior functions.

The site is limited - no place to expand. Road and pedestrian access is satisfactory; one must consider the lack of options in a mountain environment.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023

R3:

The proposed site is centrally located to the populated areas of this very large (430 sq. mi.) rural service area in southwestern Kern County. The site is served by Kern Co. Regional Transit (the only service available) with 3 stops close by, one of which is sheltered and within 1/10 of a mile of the proposed facility. Pedestrian and bicycle access is very good right now and will be excellent with major improvements planned. Automobile access is excellent from Park Drive which connects with Frazier Mt. Park Road, the major east/west arterial through the mountains. There are 39 paved on site/off street parking spaces planned with large amounts of off site/on street parking available on both sides of Park Drive. 20 spaces are provided for bicycle parking. The proposed site should be visible from Frazier Mt. Park Road, the major connector to Interstate 5 for the mountain communities. The proposed site is in close proximity to other regional and community services including Post Office, County Information center, Museum, Community Hall, Health Center, and retail establishments. The site is of adequate size for the planned facility but does not allow for much later expansion.

EVALUATION FORM  
**Frazier Park Branch Library (Kern Co. Library) 2023**

***Financial Capacity***

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

**Rating Panel Comments:**

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.